

the same case with regard to Manrique's catalogue, the Bhūiyās of Chandekan, Jassor, Bacala, and Bulvā suggesting Hindū Zamīndārs, and it does not follow that Manrique or Dr. Wise is wrong for the period each refers to.

Dr. Wise's list has the disadvantage of relegating to a small portion of Eastern Bengal a preponderating number of the Bhūiyās, and of not accounting for the rest. Manrique's enumeration takes in the whole of Bengal. Dr. Wise objected to it because Orissa, "Jagannāth," and Midinīpūr could not have had separate rulers, and the name of Bengala seemed to recall the fabulous city on which so much was written by the travellers of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. (*J.A.S.B.*, 1875, p. 182.) These objections must be overruled.

1. Dr. Wise did not notice the fact that Jagannāth was corrected to Jassor among Manrique's errata.

2. The term Bengala, as applied to a town, can never have created any difficulty to the travellers visiting Bengal in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. Unfortunately, so little attention has been paid to the accounts of Bengal written by the earliest European travellers in Bengal, especially the Portuguese, that the passages in which the name of Bengala is found, as applied to a town, have never been properly collated. The general impression produced on me by my reading is that the term has been used for a variety of places: Sonārgāon, Sātgaon, Chittagong, and even such places as Hūgli and Chandernagar; that, in fact, it applied to the chief port at the time. It is easy to understand why "Bengala" should have been placed at Chittagong by Portuguese cartographers. The first Portuguese settlement was at Chittagong from about 1534, and, till the time when they founded Hūgli (1578), "to go to Bengal" must have meant for the Portuguese "to go to Chittagong." *Bengala* once located at Chittagong by the Portuguese geographers, the mistake continued to be reproduced in the old maps even as late as 1743. (YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*, s.v. Bengal). Lubinus, an Augustinian writer, seeing the Hūgli convent of his Order described in 1634 as the Convent of Bengala, placed it at Chittagong, on the Cosmi (Bassein) river, too. We have letters from Chandernagar dated "*A Bengale*," where, however, "*Au Bengale*" might be the meaning. The old English expression for "*in Bengal*" was often "*at Bengal*." The difficulty for us now is to know to what particular city the travellers of a particular period applied the term. But, this is no reason why we should get impatient and speak of Bengala as a mythical city, or fancy that it was somewhere in the Sundarbans and has long since been swept

Antonio do Rozario. Set free, he prevailed on many of his ryats to become Christians. The descendants of these Christians are now mostly what we call our "Dacca cooks."

away by a tidal wave. This theory, lately revived by one of our University lecturers, has no chance of finding favour.¹

Since the twelve Bhūiyās are invariably represented as vassals of a King Emperor, we should understand that the King was not himself one of the Twelve. This conclusion is borne out by the practice still in vogue in Arakan in 1631. (Cf. *infra*). We saw above (p. 442) that the Bhūiyās are spoken of in 1610 as subject to the King of Gaur. Manrique says that the Monarch of *Bengala* "who resided formerly at Gaur" (cf. p. 20, col. 2) had under him "twelve petty Kings in the twelve Provinces under him." The Bhūiyā of Manrique's *Bengala* must then have been governor, not of a mythical city, but of the district where the King or Emperor had his capital at the time being.

Now, since the twelve Bhūiyās depended in 1640 from the Moghul Emperor, and Gaur was reduced to a heap of ruins, while Sātgaon had declined; since again the chief cities, such as Rājmahāl and Dacca, are accounted for as having had a Bhūiyā, the difficulty is where to place the residence of the Bhūiyā of *Bengala*. The mention in 1632 of "Minimican, son of Massacan, who had been Emperor of Bengal before the Moors conquered it," which I find in an unpublished letter of Fr. John Cabral, S.J., November 12, 1633, serves only to puzzle us further; for, as pointed out to me by Bābū Manmohan Chakravartī, Massacan represents Muchhā Khan, son of 'Isā Khan, who had had his capital either at Sonargaon, or Katrābūh in the neighbourhood. I suggest then that the Bhūiyā of *Bengala* in Manrique's time governed the district of Tāndā.

¹ This is not the place to discuss the question at any length. Though I differ with Sir Henry Yule from G. P. Badger's conclusions, I refer the curious to his *Travels of Ludovico di Varthema*, Hakluyt edn., London, 1863 (cf. index, s.v. Banghella), and to Sir H. Yule's *Cathay*, II. 465, p. 1.

Here is an example of the endless trouble to which we are put by the compilations of early European geographers. Peter Heyleyn in his *Cosmographie, in Four Bookes, containing the Chronographie and Historie of the whole World, and all the principall Kingdomes, Provinces, Seas and Isles thereof*, London, 1652, mentions the following towns in Bengal: *Bengala*, *Gouro*, *Catigan* [Sātgaon, or possibly Chittagong], *Taxda* [Tanda], *Porto Grande* [Chittagong], and *Porto Pequeno* [Hūgli]. *Bengala* is thus described: it "gave name to the whole Kingdom, situate on a branch of the River *Ganges*, and reckoned for one of the most beautiful towns of all the *Indies*. Exceedingly enriched by trade, but more by *Pilgrimages*, by reason of the holyness and divine operations ascribed by the *Indians* to the waters of it: there being few years in which not visited by three or four thousand Pilgrims." (Cf. *Bengal Past and Present*, Vol. II, p. 53). Now, this part of Heyleyn's compilation is based on Purchas' *Description of India*, Ch. II. (Cf. J. TALBOYS WHEELER'S *Early Travels in India*, Calcutta, 1864, p. 5.) But, whereas Purchas speaks of *Ganga Sāgar*, to which 4000 pilgrims often resorted from *Cambay* alone, and where as many as three or four hundred thousand pilgrims congregated at times, Heyleyn calls the place *Bengala*, perhaps because there is question in Purchas of a Governor of *Bengala* who gave these particulars.

It had become the capital of Bengal after Gaur, and was a favourite residence of the Moghul Governors of Bengal until the middle of the XVIIth century.

3. There is no difficulty to admit that the Bhūiyā of Orissa had his capital at Cuttack. In Bruton's time (1632) the Nawāb of Orissa lived at Cuttack.

4. Between 1628 and 1640 there was a Bhūiyā at Hijilī, whom Manrique styles the Masandolim, under which, we recognize again the sonorous title of Masnad-i-'Ālī. In 1697 the Governor of Hūglī was appointed to Hijilī. Cf. C. R. WILSON, *Old Fort William in Bengal*, I, 22.

5. The trouble which Manrique must have taken to get at the names of the Twelve Bhūiyās and his researches among the revenue papers of Rājmahāl, Multān and Kandahār (p. 409, col. 2) are a guarantee of his correctness about the Bhūiyā of Midnapore.

6. Dr. Wise's objections to Manrique's list appear to rest on the supposition that Bhātī, the country where the Bārah Bhūiyās ruled, was "the lowland subject to the influx of the tide." Cf. BLOCHMANN, *Contributions to the Geogr. and Hist. of Bengal*, p. 18. Col. Jarrett described it similarly as "the coast-strip of the Sunderbuns from Hijlī to the Meghna." Cf. *Āin*, II, 116, n. 3. Indeed, Abul Fazl has puzzled all his commentators by describing Bhātī thus: "Bhātī is a low-lying country, and is called by that Hindī name, because it lies lower than Bengal. It extends nearly 400 kos from east to west, and nearly 300 from south to north. On the east lies the sea and the country of Jessore; on the west lies the hill country south of Tānda; on the north the salt sea, and the extremities of the hills of Tibet." Cf. ELLIOTT, *Hist. of India*, VI. 72-73, and H. BEVERIDGE, *J.A.S.B.*, 1904, p. 58.

Mr. H. Beveridge makes some very plausible suggestions. "The unintelligible southern boundary for the country of Bhātī given by Abul Fazl, viz., "South Tānda," may be a mistake for Lānda which in the *Riyāzu-s-Salatīn* is given as one of the boundaries of Orissa. I do not, however, know what place is meant by the author of the *Riyāz*. The passage occurs at p. 15, line 10 of his work, and the full boundary is Lānda Dalūl..... According to Abul Fazl's description, it [Bhātī] was a very large tract of country, and its breadth from N.E.S. was 300 kos, or more than Bengal, whose breadth from N.E.S. was only 200 kos. Apparently, it included the whole of East Bengal, together with much of Sylhet. The eastern boundary of Bhātī is given by Abul Fazl as Ḥabsha, or as Jasur (the MSS. do not agree), and Professor Dowson has rendered this as Jessore (ELLIOTT, VI. 73). But Abul Fazl calls the boundary a *Wilāyat* or country, and Jessore was not even a Sarkar in his time, but only an alternative name for a pargana. I therefore believe that the boundary meant is